



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/930,353	08/15/2001	Ming-Chung Sung	01894347	3474

7590 08/09/2004

Joseph A. Mahoney
MAYER, BROWN & PLATT
P.O. Box 2828
Chicago, IL 60690-2828

EXAMINER

GREENE, DANIEL L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3621

DATE MAILED: 08/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/930,353

Applicant(s)

SUNG ET AL.

Examiner

Daniel L. Greene

Art Unit

3621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 August 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 August 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kravitz U.S. Patent 6,029,150 [Kravitz] as applied to claims 1-10 and further in view of Randle et al. U.S. Patent 6,594,647 [Randle].

As per claim 1:

Kravitz discloses:

registering a digital certificate in the certificate authority module by the user via the digital media for generating a log data, the certificate authority module outputting the log data to the authentication device of the management module in a predetermined period; Col. 23, lines 1-67.

inputting the digital certificate in the service provider module by the user via the digital media for generating a digital signature, the service provider module outputting the digital signature to the authentication device of the management module; Col. 24, lines 30-67.

authenticating the digital signature according to a predetermined procedure for generating an authentication code; Col. 27, lines 25-67.

Art Unit: 3621

verifying the effectiveness of the user's authentication in the service provider module, and providing the user with the online transaction for generating a corresponding first transaction data to the transaction module; Col. 28, lines 1-67.

processing the first transaction data in the transaction module for generating a second transaction data to the transaction device of the management module; Col. 32, lines 55-67

recording the second transaction data in the transaction device, and outputting the second transaction data to the service provider module; Col. 28, lines 5-67.

displaying the second transaction data in the service provider module; Col. 34, lines 42-49.

Kravitz discloses the claimed invention except for the wherein the digital signature, the authentication code, the first transaction data and the second transaction data are respectively based on the digital certificate for encryption in the transmission process of the online transaction system.

Randle teaches that it is known in the art to provide a wherein the digital signature, the authentication code, the first transaction data and the second transaction data are respectively based on the digital certificate for encryption in the transmission process of the online transaction system. Col. 4, lines 30-67. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the payment and transaction system of Kravitz with the wherein the digital signature, the authentication code, the first

Art Unit: 3621

transaction data and the second transaction data are respectively based on the digital certificate for encryption in the transmission process of the online transaction system of Randle, in order to provide complete information concerning the transaction.

As per claim 2:

Kravitz further discloses:

wherein the authentication device and the transaction device independently operate in the management module. Fig. 1.

As per claim 3:

Kravitz further discloses:

wherein each management module respectively manages a plurality of corresponding digital media, the user registers a corresponding digital certificate in the certificate authority module via the corresponding digital media for generating a corresponding log data stored in the certificate authority module and the authentication device of the corresponding management module respectively. Col. 22-23, lines 1-67.

As per claim 4:

Kravitz further discloses:

herein the predetermined procedure comprises the steps of:

Art Unit: 3621

(a) checking whether the corresponding relationship between the digital certificate and the management module exists; Col. 29, lines 19-67.

(b) if YES in step (a), authenticating the digital signature with the corresponding log data stored in the corresponding authentication device for generating the authentication code, and outputting the authentication code to the service provider module. Col. 30, lines 1-67.

As per claim 5:

Kravitz further discloses:

wherein if No in step (a), outputting the digital signature to the certificate authority module, authenticating the digital signature with the corresponding log data stored in the certificate authority module for generating the authentication code, and outputting the authentication code to the service provider module. Col. 31, lines 1-67.

As per claim 6:

Kravitz further discloses:

wherein the predetermined procedure comprises the step of authenticating the digital signature with the log data stored in the authentication device for generating the authentication code, and outputting the authentication code to the service provider module. Col. 29, lines 19-67.

As per claim 7:

Art Unit: 3621

Kravitz further discloses:

wherein the online transaction system further comprises a virtual account module connected to the transaction module for providing an account data, the user updating the account data according to a predetermined method. Col. 33-34, lines 1-67.

As per claim 8:

Kravitz further discloses:

wherein the predetermined method comprises the step of updating the account data by an automated teller machine. Col. 12, lines 1-67.

As per claim 9:

Kravitz and Randle discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of wherein the digital media can be a smart card.

However, Kravitz does teach about the customer electronically submitting information to be processed at a local site of a service providing machine. Col. 48, lines 63-67. Since the applicant has not disclosed that wherein the digital media can be a smart card solves any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Kravitz will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any means, method, or product to wherein the digital media can be a smart card.

As per claim 10:

Kravitz and Randle discloses the claimed invention, as discussed above, except for the step of wherein the digital media can be a biological identification device.

However, Kravitz does teach about the customer electronically submitting information to be processed at a local site of a service providing machine. Col. 48, lines 63-67 Since the applicant has not disclosed that wherein the digital media can be a biological identification device solves any stated problem in a new or unexpected way or is for any particular purpose which is unobvious to one of ordinary skill and it appears that the claimed feature does not distinguish the invention over similar features in the prior art since, the teachings of Kravitz will perform the invention as claimed by the applicant with any means, method, or product to wherein the digital media can be a biological identification device.

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims below for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

Art Unit: 3621

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Daniel L. Greene whose telephone number is 703-306-5539. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Thur. 8am-6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, James P. Trammell can be reached on 703-305-9768. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

7/29/2004

DLG


JAMES P. TRAMMELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600